

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-20 and 23-43 are pending. By this Response, claims 1, 18, 36, 37 and 38 are amended and claims 39-43 are added. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-16, 18-20, 23-24, 27, 34 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda, et al. (US 6,546,052) in view of Murakami, et al. (US 5,057,940); claims 8-9, 11-13, 17, 25-26, 28-31 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda, Murakami and Hibino (JP 06-165173A); and claims 14-15 and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda, Murakami and Agraharam (US 6,414,707). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

For reasons of brevity, applicants arguments in the Response dated May 3, 2005 are hereby incorporated by reference.

The Examiner maintains that the combination of Maeda and Murakami teaches the claimed features of independent claims 1, 18 and 36-38. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Embodiments of the present invention recited in claims 1, 18, 36, 37 and 38 provide a composite means that combines a part or all an encoded natural scene with an object encoded in advance of capturing and encoding the natural scene. On the transmission side, this is accomplished prior to transmitting the data and on the receiving side, this is accomplished prior to decoding the received data.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Maeda and Murakami do not teach or suggest encoding an entire natural scene, combining parts are all of the encoded scene with a different object previously encoded in advance.

Specifically, Maeda teaches a moving image transmission system that senses a moving image and extracts and encodes the extracted image. In Maeda's system, two kinds of signals are processed, a first signal from camera 101 and a second signal from camera 102. The signals from camera 101 are made with a "blue back", and are therefore not natural signals. See column 7, line 11. On the other hand, the signals from camera 102 are not object-encoded as shown in Fig. 1 of Maeda. Thus, an object-encoding natural and complete signal is not extracted and encoded and is not combined with an object previously encoded and stored in advance in the transmission device prior to transmission. See column 7, lines 42-56.

Murakami teaches an image signal transmitting receiving system in which a face image is separated into face image information and background image information. A 3-dimensional polygon model is adjusted to the extracted face image. The background image information and face model are then encoded separately and transmitted to a receiver separately. At the receiver, the face and background are decoded and combined. See column 3, lines 30-50, column 5, lines 2-15 and column 6, lines 7-19. Thus, Murakami teaches encoding an image in separate parts. These separate parts are encoded and recombined at the receiver. An object representing a different image which has been encoded and stored in advance in the transmission device, is not combined with the extracted image or background information prior to transmission or prior to decoding.

The Office Action alleges that Murakami provides the teaching of combining a part or all of the object encoded with an object different from the object of the video signal supplied from outside the object encoded in advance, as recited in embodiments of the independent claims. The Office Action column 3, lines 4 through column 6, line 57 to provide such teaching.

Applicants respectfully submit that Murakami does not combine the natural image data with the different separate object encoded in advance. The face image in Murakami is the natural image. This image is separated into background image and face image. See column 3, lines 31-34 and column 4, lines 65 through column 5, line 10. The same data, i.e. background image and face image is combined at the receiver side after being encoded and transmitted separately, thus it is not a natural or complete signal. A different background object encoded in advance is not combined prior to transmission with a part or all of the natural and complete encoded image nor prior to decoding in a receiver.

Thus, the combination of Maeda and Murakami fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a medium encoding means for object-encoding a complete video signal of a natural scene supplied from outside; a transmission stream composite means for combining a part or all of objects encoded by the medium encoding means, with an object which is different from an object of the video signal supplied from outside, object-encoded and stored in the video encoding/transmitting device in advance, as recited in claim 1;

a stream receiving means for receiving object encoded natural and complete video data; a received stream composite means for combining a part or all of objects in the video data received by the stream receiving means, with an object which is an object encoded in advance, as recited in claim 18;

a medium encoding means for object encoding either or both of a complete video signal of a natural scene and an audio signal supplied from the outside; a transmission stream composite means for combining a part or all of objects encoded by the medium encoding means, with an object which is the object encoded and stored in the transmission processing unit in

advance; ...a stream receiving means for receiving either or both of complete video data and the audio data which are object encoded; a received stream composite means for combining an object in either or both of natural and complete video data and the audio data received by the stream receiving means with an object which is object encoded in advance, as recited in claim 36;

a medium encoding means for object encoding either or both of a complete video signal of a natural scene and an audio signal supplied from the outside, a transmission stream composite means for combining a part or all of objects encoded by the medium encoding means, with an object which is object encoded and stored in the video encoding/transmitting device in advance, as recited in claim 37; and

a transmission device for object encoding either or both of a complete signal of a natural scene and an audio signal supplied from the outside, and transmitting a part of objects in either or both of the object encoded video data and audio data; and the video receiving/decoding device having: a stream receiving means for receiving either or both of the object encoded natural and complete video data and audio data transmitted from transmission device, a received stream composite mean for combining an object in either or both of the video data and the audio data received by the stream receiving means, with an object which is object encoded in advance, as recited in claim 38.

Further, embodiments of the present invention recited in dependent claims 39 through 43 further define the composite means as being able to supply the transmitter or decoder with part of the natural object encoded, the entire natural object encoded or the created combined video data that includes the natural encoded object combined with a different object encoded in advance.

This provides the composite means with great flexibility and manipulating the natural image obtained.

In contrast, the system of Maeda and Murakami do not have such flexibility and are rigid in how they obtain, encode and decode objects. Maeda and Murakami provide specific extraction and encoding functions and do not provide the ability to choose between supplying part of a encoded natural image all of the encoded natural image or a combined image created by a composite means. Thus, neither Maeda nor Murakami teach or suggest a composite means that is capable of supplying a part of the object encoded, all of the object encoded or the combined video data to a transmitting device, as recited in claims 39, 41 and 42 or decoding device, as recited in claims 40 and 43.

Further, Habino and Abraham fail to make up for the deficiencies of Maeda and Murakami.

Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Maeda and Murakami. Maeda teaches a system that requires a three bodied structure of a transmitter, image editor and receiver. Murakami, on the other hand, teaches a system that requires only two bodied structure of a transmitter and receiver. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine teachings of the three bodied structure of Maeda with the two bodied structure of Murakami.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that neither nor Maeda teach the above noted claimed features recited in independent claims 1, 18, 36, 37 and 38. Thus, the combination of Maeda and Murakami fail to establish a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

as each and every feature of the claims is not taught by the combination. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 6-20 and 23-43 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant